

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated July 2, 2004.

Claims 24-29 were withdrawn from consideration as directed to a different invention than claims 1-5 and 7-23, the other pending claims. Claim 24 is being amended, without changing its scope, so that it now depends properly from claim 2. Rejoinder and examination of claims 24-29 is therefore requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 were rejected over the admitted prior art on pages 1-2, taken in view of Leander. Claims 1, 3-5 and 10-11 are being canceled. Allowance of claims 2, 7-9 and 12-29 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 is directed to a double-sided adhesive tape having first and second opposing sides, comprising:

- on each side, a pattern comprising adhesive and non-adhesive sections, wherein the pattern is repeated more than two times across the tape with a predetermined spacing therebetween; and
- wherein an adhesive section on said first side is in contact with a non-adhesive section on said second side.

The admitted prior art includes single-sided and double-sided tapes in various shapes and configurations such as rolls, flags and notepads. The adhesive material in a double-sided tape must either be protected by a lining or release layer, or otherwise, if not so protected, must be a special low-strength adhesive so that the adhesive layers can be adhered to and then separated from each other.

It would be desirable to reduce the amount of adhesive required, and also to avoid the need for a lining or release layer in a double-sided tape.

To this end, the invention of claim 2 is a double-sided tape, with a pattern of adhesive and non-adhesive sections which repeats more than two times across the width of the tape with spacing between the patterns. The Examiner points out that Leander discloses an adhesive tape having repeating patterns. However, Leander does not contemplate placing its patterns on a

double-sided tape; and in fact contains no teachings at all about how to make a double-sided tape.

In fact, Leander teaches away from the feature in the final paragraph of claim 2, namely that an adhesive section on the first side of the tape is in contact with a non-adhesive section on the second side of the tape.

Leander teaches away from this feature, because it teaches affirmatively that a release layer must be present between the adhesive portions (which are disposed exclusively on one side of the tape) and the other face of the tape which is contacted by the adhesive portions. See col. 2, lines 26-28.

Summarizing, Leander neither considers nor contains any teachings about a double-sided tape, and even teaches affirmatively that there must be a release layer between one side of the tape containing an adhesive portion, and the other side of the tape, contrary to the last paragraph of claim 2.

Therefore, the admitted prior art and Leander et al., taken together, neither disclose nor suggest the features of claim 2.

Claims 7 and 17 recite respectively a dispenser containing either a single-sided or a double-sided adhesive tape. Claim 7 is being placed in independent form without changing its scope, and therefore not for purposes of patentability. None of the cited prior art has any relevance to the dispensers claimed. These claims and their dependent claims should be allowed.

Claims 12, 16, 19, 21 and 25 previously recited that the adhesive sections of the adhesive tape are narrower than the non-adhesive sections. These have been amended to clarify their subject matter, without substantially narrowing the scope of the claims. The amendments are not made for purposes of patentability. They now recite, with minor variations:

wherein the adhesive sections on the first side of the adhesive tape
are narrower than the non-adhesive sections on said second side;
such that said adhesive sections on said first side contact
exclusively non-adhesive sections on said second side.

Again, there is no teaching of a double-sided tape having such a feature in the prior art.

Claim 20 is directed to a notepad comprising a double-sided adhesive tape having the same features as recited in claim 2. Claims 20-23 should be allowed for the same reasons as claim 2.

Accordingly, allowance of claims 2, 7-9 and 12-29 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 at (703) 872-9306, on December 2, 2004:

James A. Finder

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

December 2, 2004

Date of Signature

JAF:msd

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder

Registration No.: 30,173

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.